HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 2 Monday, January 13, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

JAN 13 1958

CONGRESS OPENS: *Johnson out in front*.... (page 1)
BIG SPENDING: *Sputnik hitchhikers* (pages 1 and 3)
SUMMIT: *Dulles thwarts Stassen*.... (page 2)
LABOR: *Inside the rackets committee*.... (page 2)
John L. tags Reuther.... (page 4)

Thunderheads Over Congress: "Restless" and "suspicious" are the acid adjectives which best describe the mood of members of Congress as the opening bell clanged this week.

"Restless" — because like most Americans they feel insecure in face of the rising Soviet threat; and, because both parties are split, they have uneasy feelings about their own leaderships.

"Suspicious" — because a lot of appeasers of communism and many anti-militarist New Dealers have suddenly appeared in a new guise. "We never realized that there were so many military experts in this country," is a common crack on the Hill.

Lack of confidence in Eisenhower is a strong undercurrent in the conversation of Republican rank and file members — as well as of those even higher in the congressional GOP hierarchy.

Some feel (as reported last week in these columns) that the party would be better off if Ike should resign and let Nixon take over. The logical aftermath then would be a "honeymoon" which would breathe new life into the party throughout the country.

"But Sherman Adams and Hagerty won't let him" — so goes the refrain. The chronic conflict between the Palace Guard and Capitol Hill Republicans (except for the tattered remnant of Modern Republicans) goes on.

In Republican cloakrooms runs a story about a meeting of GOP leaders from Congress and the National Committee, together with Sherman Adams and aides. The latter sought to get the congressional leaders to organize a defense of the President against Democratic attacks. The bitter response was: "Why should we? The next day you [Adams] under the President's name will double-cross us on appointments or other matters." And Chairman Meade Alcorn was heard to repeat his recent complaints that Adams gave a patronage job to an individual from Alcorn's own state (Connecticut) without any consultation with the National Chairman.

Republicans are unhappy because Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democratic Senate leader, has grabbed the ball of "preparedness" from the White House and is running strongly with it. In his speech at the opening of Congress, he even stole a march of two days on the President's State of the Union utterance, with immense effect in the cloakrooms and lobbies of Capitol Hill.

"Restlessness," also, among Democrats. For while they appreciate Johnson's cleverness, many from the South recall that it was he who put through the "civil rights" bill (which they heartily dislike).

Johnson has indeed "grabbed the ball" (one Southern Senator remarked, "It may be the ball of destiny"), and is the "man of the hour" in Congress and in Washington. The country, it is reported, craves leadership, and speculation on Johnson's future grows apace. Some conservatives across the aisle remark approvingly that the Democratic leader has moved away from the "liberal" role which he adopted when he first came to the Senate nine years ago.

"Suspicion," cold and "fishy-eyed," marks the attitude of many — perhaps of most — members towards the state of the country's defense preparations (in missiles and rockets). The suspicion centers on the Budget, naturally.

Capitol Hill people note the appearance of the Rockefeller Report (and its precursor, the widely "leaked" Gaither Report), timed exquisitely, just before the opening of Congress. Those with long memories recall how, in 1940, the fall of France and the consequent preparedness uproar in the US set the stage for unlimited spending, collectivist waste and all-out catering to the labor bosses.

At that time (the Editor of HUMAN EVENTS remembers) the New Deal bureaucrats made no bones about their sentiments concerning preparedness: "It gives us our chance to spend as we wish, with no effective opposition from the Southern conservative Democrats."

Similarly, today, conservatives on the Hill perceive the outline of an identical campaign looming up. First, the extreme left-winger, Robert Nathan, an old New Deal bureaucrat, and the ADA call for astronomical spending (including welfare appropriations). Then, on the "egghead" level, cloaked in "moderation," comes the Rockefeller Report—sponsored by a panel on which numerous "innocents" in business circles are interspersed with others who have long left-wing records (see "Rockefeller Report" item, below).

"The Anna Rosenbergs and Chester Bowles on that committee," runs conservative comment, "can cleverly manipulate the 'innocents' gradually into what we had in the last war. It's two bites of a cherry: first, implementation of the Rockefeller Report, then moving into

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hoffa and Beck. But the question persists: how about Hoffa's enemy, Reuther?

Capital opinion now gives particular attention to one among a number of factors: a member of the committee who may prove decisive in helping the group make its choice on this matter. He is Senator Sam Ervin (D.-N.C.), a member of the committee who has not so far cut much of a figure in the hearings, and whose stand on Reuther is a matter of conjecture.

The other members stack up as follows: presumably friendly to Reuther — McNamara (D.-Mich.), Kennedy (D.-Mass.) and Ives (R.-N.Y.). (Some leaders in the Liberal Party of New York, a labor-"liberal" outfit, have recently suggested that Ives should receive their group's endorsement in his race for re-election next year. It would, therefore, be surprising if Ives were not in Reuther's corner.)

Sharply critical of Reuther are three other members on the committee: Goldwater (R.-Ariz.), Curtis (R.-Neb.) and Mundt (R.-S.D.). In the middle is the Chairman, Senator McClellan (D.-Ark.). McClellan has moved to push the probe of Reuther. Will he be able to stick to this course over opposition of the pro-Reuther members of his group?

This is where Ervin comes in. The North Carolina Senator has so far not made plain which side he takes in the handling of Reuther. In the last session, he was absorbed in his great constitutional fight against the "civil rights" bill. If he joins the three Republican foes of Reuther, he may pull McClellan to the right and give him decisive backing in a real investigation of the UAW chieftain. Already, some of his prominent constituents are expressing the desire that Ervin take this definite course.

The outcome will shape the verdict on the role and achievements of the McClellan group. Will it prove a real probe of all labor, or will it go down in history as a creature moved by political partisanship?

Rockefeller Report: Washingtonians discussing the Rockefeller Report on national security, released last week, sum it up as "a piece of left-wing special pleading." They capsulize its recommendations as basically two: more and more spending at any and all levels, and a disguised return to the policy of "containment," which produced the fruitless Korean war.

Judging from the report's rather careful wording, Washington analysts conclude that its authors are in reality asking that the defense budget be jacked up until, in 1965, it reaches the phenomenal proportions of $60 billion annually. (The Report asks minimum spending increases of $3 billion a year, and says that "the cost of military programs will continue to rise until at least 1965.")

The Report does not suggest any corresponding reduction in domestic expenditures, or in disbursements for obsolescent forms of defense. It apparently wants the US to maintain all presently operational forces in the defense establishment, and in general bristles with hostility toward the idea of any kind of limitation on spending. News analysts note such phrases as: "Systems of budgets, appropriations and financial management are out of gear with the radically accelerating flow of military developments. . . . There is a grave reason for concern with respect to the inadequacy of recent levels of military appropriations as well as with respect to the workings of the budgetary process," *etc.*

Considered even more significant is the Report's recommendation that the United States "develop units which can intervene rapidly and which are able to make their power felt with discrimination and versatility. . . . Our mobile forces must be tailored to the gamut of possible limited wars, which may range from conflicts involving several countries to relatively minor police actions." This policy proposal, it is pointed out, is in reality a recommendation that the United States become involved in an infinite series of Korean conflicts, fought at the time and place chosen by the Communists.

Those who make these observations also point out that this return to containment is identical with that advocated last year in a much-ballyhooed book called *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (Harper). A glance beneath the surface shows that the similarity is far from accidental: the Rockefeller report and the *Nuclear Weapons* book were authored by the same man: Henry A. Kissinger, Associate Director of the Harvard Center for International Affairs. Comparison shows, in fact, that the "Report" — pictured as the outgrowth of 18 months of toil by a "distinguished panel" — is simply a condensation of Kissinger's book. Moreover, "The Over-All Panel" and "The Security Panel" of the Rockefeller Fund, which published the report, interlock closely with the Council on Foreign Relations "study group" which spawned the Kissinger book. Overlapping members of the two groups include: Gordon Dean, Frank Altschul, General James MacCormack, Carroll Wilson, Roswell L. Gilpatric and Frank C. Nash (deceased).

Some other members of the Rockefeller Panel attract the suspicous attention of Capital veterans: they are Anna Rosenberg and Chester Bowles, two ultra-left-wing relics of the Truman administration.

It is clear, say the analysts, that an important function of the Rockefeller Report is — under cover of the missile controversy — to drive home the idea that the US, in the name of "limited war," must return to the bloody treadmill of containment, abandoning the "massive retaliation" and "liberation" goals first proclaimed by the Eisenhower Administration. Thus the Rockefeller report surreptitiously seeks to drive home the argument advanced in *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy;* and although both documents are written by the same man, under practically identical auspices, the public is not made aware of these multiple connections. It is, say military analysts, the classic maneuver of a "double envelopment."

(Also noted is the fact that one member of the Rockefeller committee which advocates limitless defense spending is former Atomic Energy Chairman Gordon Dean. Dean — also Chairman of the Council on Foreign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monolithic spending of the Nathan variety. Fabian socialism on the march!"

Thus voices rise to challenge the spenders. "Sputnik hitchhikers" who seize the crisis for a ride to socialism are denounced. And many members of Congress, notably Representative Clarence Cannon (D.-Mo.), Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Senator Dennis Chavez (D.-N.M.) of the Senate Armed Services Committee and Representative Ben Jensen (R.-Iowa), lift the banner of economy. They speak of offsetting increases for military spending by elimination of other spending.

In this connection Republicans (and not only Republicans) welcome the statement of a forward-looking businessman, Lothair Teetor (head of the Perfect Circle Company and formerly Assistant Secretary of Commerce), who demands a tax cut in the interest of stemming the developing recession. Teetor, as the congressional curtain rose, warned that "we are drifting into socialism," and stated flatly that a big tax cut is needed to restore business confidence. He rejected Administration opposition to tax cuts (on the ground of added defense expenditures). "All we have to do," Teetor said, "is to cut the nonessentials so we can afford the essentials."

Thus, the stage is set for one of the most crucial and tumultuous sessions in congressional history.

LAST CHANCE AT HALF PRICE

Bound Volumes for 1957 — with index — may be ordered for March delivery. ORDERS POSTMARKED BEFORE JANUARY 15, 1958 will be accepted at the $7.50 rate. Regular price, $15. Bound indexed volumes for 1955 and 1956 available at $15. None available for previous years.

Ike's Speech: The President's State of the Union address January 9 drew from members of Congress the reverent applause usually accorded a President in such circumstances — plus much praise for the "pluck" he showed in his present physical condition. The next day, however, discordant notes were openly sounded by Congressional Democrats.

In private, many Republicans as well were not enthusiastic. "Mechanically," they granted, the speech was unusually well delivered. But, as one GOP member ("not for attribution") told HUMAN EVENTS: "That demand for foreign aid — I didn't like it at all." On the subject of Government aid to education, a veteran legislator remarked that, "if the mail from my constituents is an indicator, they are solidly against it." A Representative from a rural district commented: "I note Ike said the whole power of the Government would be behind business in the event of a recession, but there wasn't any similar promise to agriculture. I'm calling that to the attention of my constituents."

Press gallery comment included: "I counted 25 fluffs in his enunciation." And: "He certainly was tired at the end of the speech." And: "The White House crowd is worried — say he's working too hard."

But — all agree — it was an historic speech.

Foreign Policy Struggle: As Capitol Hill filled up with legislators, the first round in the struggle between Stassen (who wants disarmament and a Summit conference with Russia) and Dulles (who is opposed to these ideas) was fought. All observers agreed that Dulles had the upper hand — for the moment. Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee laughed at the jest of one member who remarked hopefully: "Childe Harold fired his six-shooter at Dulles, and the President has now taken away his gun."

The big scene of the drama took place, coincidental with the start of Congress, in another part of Washington, at a closed-door meeting of the National Security Council (the high Executive group which determines US strategy). As relayed to HUMAN EVENTS, this is what took place: Stassen argued for disarmament, for a nuclear testing ban and for a Summit meeting with the Communist bosses. Interestingly, Vice President Nixon led the attack on Stassen, saying — among other things — that only the President could decide on disarmament matters and that a Summit meeting was not advisable. Nixon praised Dulles highly for his work as Secretary and supported his stand in opposition to a Summit meeting. The Council decided against Stassen. So far so good, but other rounds in the struggle are yet to come.

It is also significant that former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, a Dulles critic regarded as "soft" on Russia, reportedly does not now favor a Summit conference; according to friends, he believes that now is not the time, when Russia is in a "strong" diplomatic position.

On the day after the NSC meeting, Dulles went to Capitol Hill and found most legislators on his side. He told the House Foreign Affairs Committee flatly that he did not want a Summit meeting unless positive results could be expected. Members of the committee told HUMAN EVENTS that, with a very few exceptions, the 32-man body was wholeheartedly with Dulles.

According to many who have talked with Dulles, the latter does not believe that unification of Germany can be obtained by an agreement with the Soviet Union, even if we withdraw our troops from West Germany. He is said to be convinced that Moscow will never allow East Germany — now under a Soviet puppet government — to join with West Germany to make one big state of 70 million people. Russia, he is reported to have said, fears such a united Germany.

Dulles' views have so pleased members of Congress that a number of the legislators are talking of putting through a joint resolution of the two Houses to the effect that a Summit meeting should not be held. This would serve notice on those of the Palace Guard who persist in pushing the Summit idea.

Inside Rackets Committee: As Congress opens, the McClellan Committee approaches a crossroads in its sensational career. Whether it will really "go to town" in an investigation of Walter Reuther remains uncertain. So far the group has done a thorough job on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Relations study group — is a high-ranking official in the General Dynamics Corporation. It has been estimated that General Dynamics — which receives over $1 billion a year from air, missile and similar contracting — does over 85 per cent of its business with the Government. Frank Pace, Jr., a member of the Council on Foreign Relations group, is the President of General Dynamics.)

Education Front: As battle-lines form for the struggle over Federal aid to education, conservatives note some hopeful signs:

● The Association of American Colleges, meeting last week in Miami Beach, issued a forcible warning to Federal aid addicts. "Most of the educators here," said Association President J. Ollie Edmunds, "would like to see the colleges supported in the traditional American way — by industry, foundations or private individuals. We are proposing a bold and dramatic program to solve the critical problems facing higher education. But it is to be an American program, not one made in the Soviet Union." (The Association program would establish an educational fund of $1 billion annually, to be supplied by private sources.)

● Mortimer Smith, Executive Secretary of the Council for Basic Education, has aligned the authority of his respected organization against the Federal aid proponents. In a letter to the Washington *Post*, January 8, Smith said that "my fear is that this mountain of Federal cash they seek will only strengthen and perpetuate the 'soft' theory of education which they have imposed on the schools for 30 or more years. . . . I suggest that before we Americans plug too hard for Federal money, we ask ourselves if we are satisfied with the *status quo* in education and want to buy more of the same."

Lewis On Reuther: Most notable recent TV broadcast was an interwiew of John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers, by Martin Agronsky on the "Look Here" program, Sunday, January 5. Lewis' talk contained such punchlines as: "Well, Reuther is an earnest Marxist, chronically inebriated, I should think, by the exuberance of his own verbosity." Agronsky pressed the bushy-browed leader — "you don't imply by saying that he is a chronic Marxist, you don't imply in any sense a dedication to the Communist idea?" *Lewis:* "I didn't so express it, no. I wouldn't go so far at the moment." *Agronsky:* "Well certainly his record demonstrates that in terms of his dealing with communism he was more instrumental than anyone else in cleaning the labor movement of the Communist influence. Do you accept that, sir?" *Lewis:* "No, I don't think I would go that far in my estimate of his accomplishments."

Lewis also paid his respects to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Agronsky reminded the labor leader of his estimate of FDR as a "dictator" and a "warmonger," and wondered if Lewis would change that appraisal now. Lewis replied: "I was in a position and had enough knowledge of world affairs at that time to believe the world war was not necessary. That peace could have been made by the exercise of the same leadership for peace that was later exercised by Mr. Roosevelt and his administration to bring about war. . . . I would not modify or retract any word that I uttered dealing with those questions, in public addresses or otherwise, and I made myself particularly clear at that time. Those are still my convictions."

Fleeing the Welfare State: Early in 1957, HUMAN EVENTS published an article by British author Colm Brogan ("Fleeing the Welfare State," March 9, 1957), reporting that young people were leaving Great Britain in droves, to escape the ravages of British "welfarism." Now a year-end survey discloses that almost a quarter of a million Britons fled their homeland in 1957, escaping to Canada, the United States and various countries in the British Commonwealth. The number of emigrants — 220,000 — represented a rise of 50 per cent over the number for the previous year. Also confirming Brogan's analysis is a public opinion poll, reported from London, disclosing that one out of five Britons wants to leave the British Isles. Reasons: poor climate, high cost of living, high taxes.

Between Covers: Noted economist David McCord Wright (currently at McGill University) punctures the fallacious belief that Christian ethics sanction Socialist practice, in the Fall, 1957 issue of *Modern Age* — the conservative quarterly edited by Russell Kirk. Professor Wright's article, "Toward a Christian Approach in Judging Economic Systems," appears with essays by Wilhelm Roepke, Father John Courtney Murray and others. Free copies may be obtained by writing to: *Modern Age*, c/o Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Inc., 64 East Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill. (Subscriptions: $3 annually.)

MAX EASTMAN, author: "HUMAN EVENTS is extremely valuable to me. It is the only periodical coming to my house that I open and read regularly every time it comes."

LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Member of Congress, First District of Wisconsin: "HUMAN EVENTS is chock-full of current information, many items of which never reach the daily press. I would not be without it."

Additional copies of this 4-page News Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 2 HUMAN EVENTS January 13, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

WOMAN'S PLACE IS UNDER THE DOME

By ELIZABETH CHURCHILL BROWN

Women already constitute a powerful force in American politics. Disinterested and objective, they could — if they fully realized their own strength — become the most powerful force of all. This article tells what women should do and how they should go about it. Send a copy of this article to all the officers, the program chairmen, and the past presidents of each woman's organization in your community.

SOME 10,000 Communists in the United States boast that they can get 50,000 letters to members of Congress on any given subject within 72 hours. No one knows better than the Communists the power of letter writing.

It is high time the American public — and, in particular, women — realize it too. Women not only have the time to write but also the time to study politics. Women, properly organized and informed, could rule the roost under the Capitol Dome — a million Molly Pritchards strong.

Let us see what the lack of organization and knowledge has cost our Nation. To name only a few of the important roll call votes in the United States Senate during the last few years, in which proper organization might have carried the day, I give you the Status of Forces Treaty, the "civil rights" bill, all the appropriations bills, aid to Yugoslavia, and last but not least the Bricker Amendment.

The Communists have been winning the letter-writing campaign because they are well organized and go about it in an intelligent way. Their agents in Washington know every detail of law and maneuver needed for the passage of a bill. They have an intimate knowledge of the members of Congress — their fallibilities, their ambitions, their strength. They know how the strings are pulled, votes traded, and how the blackjack can be applied to the weak.

Conservatives seem to feel that they have no "voice" and no power to deter the leftist trend in legislation. But they do not realize that neither the White House, nor the Congress nor the Supreme Court can long withstand the announced beliefs and desires of the people of the United States. Only by the letters they receive can the President, the legislators, and the justices know what the Nation wants and demands. When any of them are swamped with letters and telegrams of protest they are truly frightened.

The Bricker Amendment

Let us study the cause for the defeat of the Bricker Amendment. Few will forget that the amendment to the Bricker Amendment, the George Amendment, lost by only one vote. There were several Senators who were accused of being that "one vote," but one in particular demonstrates how the lack of political knowledge by one specific citizen caused a vote of "nay."

A Senator who, strangely enough, had no feelings one way or another regarding the George Amendment, decided he would use his vote to "pay off" one of his financial backers. Knowing his backer (whom we shall call Mr. X) to be a strong advocate of the Bricker Amendment, he asked him how he would like him to vote on the George Amendment. The answer was "no."

In this instance the George Amendment as well as the Bricker Amendment was lost because Mr. X, although a dedicated conservative, was completely ignorant of the road the bill had to travel on its way to becoming a law.

The Bricker Amendment, being an amendment to the Constitution, had to be passed in both houses by a two-thirds vote — first in the Senate and then in the House. A two-thirds goal is always a tough assignment, particularly when the White House is opposed, and the Congressmen and Senators favoring the bill held many conferences on the strategy to be used. After the original Bricker Amendment had been defeated in the Senate they came to the conclusion that the only way to have it passed was to amend the bill with the George Amendment, which greatly weakened the original, and send it to the House.

The maneuver was to go as follows: Once passed by the Senate, the bill would go to the House Judiciary Committee where, there was good reason to believe, the original bill would be restored. House proponents of the bill had done their private poll-taking and felt assured of the passage of the strong original version of the bill, once it reached the House floor. The measure would then, as is usual in such cases, go to a conference group of members of the two Houses. It was felt that substantially the original bill would be recommended by the conference, and that final passage would follow.

This well-planned maneuver never got off the ground because the people (including Mr. X) favoring the Bricker Amendment did not know the tactical importance of passing the weak George Amendment, and therefore neglected to let their Representatives in Congress know their desires. The cost to the Nation was great.

LET US STUDY the difference in the way the Communists handled the "civil rights" bill last summer. Almost every day during the debate on the bill in both Houses, the *Daily Worker* carried information and orders for the comrades to pass on to their non-Communist friends and dupes. On August 15 the *Worker* ran a front page editorial entitled "The Zero Hour." It emphatically pointed out that although the proposed "civil rights" bill was a greatly watered-down version of what it was aiming at, this bill

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was better than no bill at all. Let the editorial speak for itself:

THE ZERO HOUR is approaching for civil rights legislation — even for the Senate-weakened version of the Administration bill now in the House Rules Committee. *We disagree with those who are in full cry for the bill's defeat.* We agree with the NAACP, the AFL-CIO executive council and other groups who have urged the House to pass the measure as *a foundation upon which to build.* (Italics added.)

* * *

The danger to the bill results from the House Republicans' pressuring their members on the Rules Committee to vote with the Dixiecrats to kill it. . . .

The next step is up to the four Republican members of the committee . . . These are Leo E. Allen, of Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio; Henry J. Latham, of New York, and Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania.

House Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, has predicted that the Rules Committee will report the bill out within one week. But during that week *the people back home have the opportunity to tell their Representatives what they think ought to be done. And through their Representatives they ought to influence committee members.* (Italics added.)

Give us a bill now. Let the campaign next year and in 1960 be conducted on the issue of how to improve it.

For 25 years the Communists have been striving for a "civil rights" bill. Unlike the Brickerites who lost interest with the advent of the George Amendment, the Communists considered passage of the watered down "civil rights" bill as a triumph. They now feel assured that with each coming session of Congress they will be able to bring enough pressure on the legislators to strengthen the bill to their own liking.

Communist Strategy

A close perusal of Communist organization and influence is instructive. Communists waste little time "talking to themselves." By the mere token of their small membership of 10,000 they are obliged to enlist the aid of non-Communists and non-Communist organizations.

Last October 17 the *Daily Worker* published a work schedule for the comrades to pass on to their friends. The headline ran thus: VISIT CONGRESSMEN ON KEY ISSUES, UE URGES. The lead off was the following: "Visits to Congressmen at home during recess by union delegations have been called for by the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America." The article then went on to present the issues the UE was emphasizing, which coincided exactly with the issues the Communist party was stressing.

ANTI-LABOR LEGISLATION.—There is a hard drive by employers for new repressive laws of Government control of unions. These proposals include a Federal "right-to-work" law, break up of company-wide bargaining by applying anti-trust laws to unions, restricting labor's political action even further than Taft-Hartley, setting up Government controls of union elections and treasuries, etc. The Congressmen should be told the facts of life about corruption in unions, and our UE position against Government control of unions should be vigorously advocated.

TAXES. — Our tax laws are rigged for the wealthy. Taxes should be cut, loopholes for the rich closed, and taxes shifted to those best able to pay. This issue should be hit hard, as it's a bread and butter issue scandalously handled by Congress. It will be up for action in 1958.

SHORTER HOURS-MINIMUM WAGES. — Congress should act on proposals now before Senate and House Labor Committees to raise the minimum wage way above its present $1 per hour level, cut the standard work week from 40 to 35 hours, and cover an added 11 million workers by this law.

SOCIAL SECURITY-EDUCATION-HOUSING.—Proposals to really improve these areas of social legislation are before Congress and are long overdue. Why doesn't Congress move?

CIVIL LIBERTIES.—Urge support in Congress of the Supreme Court assertion of traditional American Civil Liberties as against the McCarthyite witchhunts, the Un-American Committee, and repressive anti-democratic legislation. Urge Congressmen to have the courage to speak up on this issue.

(Note the use of "Un-American Committee" as the Communist name for the House Un-American Activities Committee.)

CIVIL RIGHTS. — Inform Congress of UE's strong support for effective legislation to protect the civil rights of the Negro people.

PEACE. — Without getting into involved foreign policy questions, let the Congress know the UE's policy on peace, and the desire and need for working people for a let up in the huge armaments race, and nuclear weapons dangers.

Here, then, are the orders to the comrades. What can American women do to counteract the efforts of the Communists and their stooges, the UE?

OF COURSE, the instructions quoted from the *Daily Worker* are direct orders, and being able to give orders is an advantage of the Communists which the American patriots do not have. Americans have no leaders to do their thinking for them. And if they did, it goes without saying they would not always follow their bidding. Americans like to think for themselves. For this reason it is most important that the many thousands of women patriots and their organizations should educate themselves in Washington politics. With knowledge of the facts, they will automatically do the right thing. For those interested, a pamphlet called *Enactment of a Law—Procedure on a Senate Bill* can be most helpful. (Write: Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., for Document 55, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, Senate, *Enactment of a Law.*)

The Realities of Political Survival

But more important than understanding the rules for the enactment of a law is a clear understanding of "the great game of politics" which must be played in the Capital. The hazards of this game are numerous, even for the most skilled politician. The Communists understand this thoroughly.

The legislator is perpetually being pressured by two groups, his constituents and the White House; and often the White House is able to influence the constituents. A county chairman, for example, may receive a "call from the White House." One can imagine how impressed he is when one of the President's advisers says over the long distance telephone: "Harry, the President wants your personal help on the civil rights bill." Quite often Harry is flattered into doing just that. He calls up Senator A in Washington and tells him the folks back home are in favor of the bill.

At the same time the Presidential adviser will also get busy with Senator A. He gives him a buzz on the phone, and if the Senator shows some obstinacy a personal visit is called for, and the pressuring begins. It is implied that a favorable vote may be rewarded with a juicy judgeship or ambassadorship for an important constituent. If that doesn't have effect it is then delicately hinted that an unfavorable vote may cause the President to withhold his backing in the Senator's coming election, plus the possibility that a generous allotment of party funds may be withheld. Senator A must decide whether he has more to lose from his constituents or from the Executive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He must weigh his letters from home against the power of the White House.

(Parenthetically, a young lady, new in her job as secretary in a Senator's office, was so naive that she boasted to her friends that her Senator was very popular with the President because, she said, "the White House calls him all the time!")

THE CHAIRMEN of the committees also must do some plain and fancy politicking. Appropriations for the committees (among them important investigating bodies such as the House Un-American Activities, Senate Internal Security, Senate Government Operations, *etc.)* come up for vote every year. It takes a great deal of money to pay for a committee's operation: the counsels, chief researchers, the investigators; the secretaries, filing clerks, telephones, and traveling expenses not only for the investigators who sometimes have to travel abroad for information, but expenses of witnesses who do not live in Washington. On some occasions it is less expensive to take the committee and skeleton staff to a faraway city than to pay the cost of the many witnesses who otherwise have to be called to Washington. The less money in the committee till, the less effective the committee's work.

A week or so before committee appropriations come up, the chairmen are busy talking to their colleagues, pleading their cause, and quite often trading votes. That is, a chairman will vote for Senator B's bill; Senator B in turn will vote in favor of the money for the chairman's committee.

This is politics. And with a complete knowledge of how it works it is obvious that there is no such thing as politics without expediency. It is only when a politician makes the wrong decision on where expediency lies that he gets into trouble.

Timing is Crucial

One of the most important points in the business of letter writing by constituents is to know WHEN AND HOW OFTEN TO WRITE. It is well to remember that only one important bill comes up at a time and the members of Congress are concentrating on that one issue. If a constituent writes her Senator asking him to vote against the amendments to the Immigration Act when the immediate bill on the agenda is the Hells Canyon Dam, she must remember that the Senator's office is busy sorting the mail and giving primary consideration to the letters on the dam. ***A follow-up letter on the Immigration amendments must be written when that issue comes up for debate.***

A good example for the necessity of a follow-up letter was during the foreign aid appropriations debate last year. The avalanche of mail hitting Capitol Hill demanding a cut in foreign aid appropriations caused panic in the White House as well as in the offices of Senators favoring unlimited giveaway funds. The strategists decided on two remedial plans: 1) the President would make a series of radio and TV speeches in the hope of changing the minds of the people, and 2) the voting would be delayed for a few weeks in order to give people time to think it over (or, perhaps, to forget about it). When the vote finally came up, the mail had greatly subsided, the result being that only a small portion of foreign aid was cut. Here was a case where follow-up letters could have been decisive. The White House strategy paid off because it had counted on just such apathy.

It is easy to see, too, that had the letter writers been specific as to where they wanted foreign aid cut, our real allies, such as South Korea, Turkey, Free China and Spain, would not have taken a cut in vitally needed domestic and military materials. As it is, our friends who are uncompromisingly determined to fight the Reds, are obliged to tighten up their belts another notch. In the meantime, such pro-Moscow nations as India and Yugoslavia continue to receive millions of dollars in aid, to say nothing of the help Gomulka is receiving from the US taxpayers which enables him to keep an iron hand on the citizens of Poland. In this new Congress a bill will be proposed specifying "selective aid." It will be passed if the public speaks its piece.

AN INTELLIGENT knowledge of the agenda of both the House and the Senate as well as what bills are being considered in the committees is essential to the letter writer. For various patriotic clubs, a Congressional Agenda Committee could be a most important part of the clubs' machineries. The information can easily be obtained from the offices of the legislators in Washington.

Another suggestion would be a Legislative Information Committee. Members of this committee would have the job of keeping the club membership informed on the business of the Congress. Each member should be allotted one subject as her particular assignment. If her allotted subject, for instance, is to be the amendments to the McMahon Act (which would permit our Government to share all our nuclear and missile secrets), she would take it upon herself to look for any mention of this subject in her daily newspapers, clip the item and paste it in a scrapbook. At each meeting of her committee she will read a summary report on what she has observed. The committee, in conjunction with the Legislative Agenda Committee, will then be able to inform the entire membership of the club of what amendments to the McMahon Act have been proposed, who is behind the proposals, what columnists have been for or against them, and what the amendments will mean. The Legislative Agenda Committee can then report on when the amendments will go to which committee, who the members of the House or Senate committee are and when would be the appropriate time to write the letters.

With the correspondence which would necessarily ensue between the club's committee members and the legislators' offices in Washington, the members of Congress will come to have a real respect for the work of and the opinions of the club as a whole, to say nothing of its influence back home.

How Activity Pays Off

Women who are well informed can supplement their letter writing by doing a little personal lobbying as well. HUMAN EVENTS reported the extraordinary success of a group of women who did just that in a news story entitled "It Can Be Done" (September 7, 1957). Last spring, Senator Kennedy (D.-Mass.) proposed several dangerous amendments to the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act. His proposals would have opened the floodgates to immigrants coming to this country with little screening of Communist agents,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with no regard for taking jobs away from American labor, or for the possibility of overpopulating our Nation with undesirables.

So well had Senator Kennedy done his own personal lobbying, and so cleverly and smoothly written were his amendments, that he had just about convinced himself and his followers that the votes needed were in the bag. Among others, the powerful Senate Leader, Lyndon Johnson (D.-Tex.) had been corralled into the Kennedy corner; Senator Dirksen (R.-Ill.) was brought into the fold, and a real feather in the Kennedy cap was that the co-author of the Immigration Act and strong anti-Communist, Representative Francis Walter (D.-Pa.), was beginning to weaken under the plausible arguments of the young Senator.

Women to the Rescue

Several women who had their ears close to the Capitol Dome became greatly alarmed and decided that they must quickly get some kind of miracle serum to the dying law. They persuaded a dozen women representing important patriotic organizations around the country to come to Washington. Under the guidance of Mrs. William D. Leetch, secretary of the American Coalition, they petitioned one of the immigration experts on Capitol Hill to give them a briefing. They met at the office of that society, where there were explained to them the meaning of the "fine print" clauses, the background of the amendments, who besides Senator Kennedy was behind them and exactly what the amendments would mean.

Thus armed, the women then set out to pay personal visits to members of Congress in their offices; not only to their own Representatives but to the key Senators as well. They told them that the people back home were greatly in favor of the immigration law and would greatly resent the amendments. On their return to their states, they informed their friends and club members what they had done and whom they had seen. They urged an immediate letter-writing campaign. The defeat of the amendments was in large measure owing to this small but concentrated effort of women patriots. Their calm and intelligent arguments actually persuaded a number of legislators to change their minds — including Senators Johnson and Dirksen, and Representative Walter.

ASIDE FROM actual bills coming up in Congress, there are national and international issues which can be affected by the voice of the people. The American public has the power to force an investigative hearing whether Congress or the Administration likes it or not. Had not the American public become so incensed at the dismissal of General MacArthur, it is possible that the Democrats could have sidestepped the famous "MacArthur hearings." There had been no time in history when Congress was so swamped with letters — all demanding to know why General MacArthur had been dismissed.

If the public was disappointed that they were not able to view the MacArthur hearings on their TV sets, they can only blame themselves for not demanding it. On several different occasions the late Senator Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska, then Republican Minority Leader, attempted to force a vote in the Senate for an open hearing. The Democrats, fearful of the public's reaction if they were to see and hear General MacArthur, voted the party line (with the exception of the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada). It was a close vote because several Republicans voted with the Democrats. But had Senator Wherry been backed up with pressure from the constituents he could have carried the day. He could not win fighting alone.

A new Congress is meeting and forming its committees this month. The leftists have already lined up their forces and are waiting for the opening gun. Their targets are to "improve" the "civil rights" bill; to push the Kennedy amendments to the Immigration Act again; to amend the McMahon Act in order to disclose our military scientific secrets to allies whose security record is suspect; to defeat right-to-work legislation; to force Federal aid to schools; to enlarge foreign aid.

Nothing would please the men in the Kremlin more than to see America systematically destroyed from within, by laws passed in our own Congress. It is up to the women of America, therefore, to write to their members of Congress, urging defeat of this left-wing legislative program.

Above all, it is up to them to help forestall the greatest danger facing our country today: the proposed Summit meeting between Eisenhower and Khrushchev. The result of such a conference would be acceptance of the "coexistence" formula for surrender to communism, both at home and abroad. It is more than possible that it would mean the repeal of the Smith Act and other anti-subversive measures, and the end of the Un-American Activities Committee. Letters protesting the proposed Summit conference and the acceptance of "coexistence" must go to Senators and Representatives without delay. *Now* is the time for all good women to come to the aid of their country.

Elizabeth Churchill Brown, former newspaperwoman, is the wife of Constantine Brown, national columnist and Foreign Editor of the Washington *Evening Star*. Last year she published *The Enemy At His Back* (The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y. $4). Mrs. Brown is a member of the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club of Maryland, the National Women's Press Club and the American Women's Press Club.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "WOMAN'S PLACE IS UNDER THE DOME" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name .....

Street.....

City .....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED